

pathway to responsible parental engagement, and that is marriage. We must continue to work to change the policies that in effect punish the decision to marry, such as welfare rules that make it more difficult for married couples with children to qualify in comparison to single-parent families.

We must work to address the decline of traditional marriage. Unless we provide, as a society, cultural reinforcement for the often difficult path of loyal, committed, monogamous, heterosexual unions, we should not expect to see the institution of marriage thrive.

If society says the family structure does not matter, what is the incentive to get or to stay married when the road gets rough, which it often does? As one marriage expert has said, "If marriage is just a way of publicly celebrating private love, then there is no need to encourage couples to stick it out for the sake of children. If family structure does not matter, why have marriage laws at all? Do adults or do they not have a basic obligation to control their desires so that children can have mothers and fathers?"

That, my colleagues, is the real question in the marriage debate. That is why we have a vital interest in defending the institution of traditional marriage from attempts to define it out of existence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the period for morning business be extended by 10 minutes on each side.

Mr. REID. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the Democratic leader wanted to speak. He yielded to the Senator from Kansas. If the Senator from Texas will withhold for a minute, he should be coming here.

Mr. CORNYN. I am sorry, Madam President, is there objection?

Mr. REID. Yes, there is, until the Democratic leader gets here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. REID. How much time is remaining on—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 7 minutes, 15 seconds that remain.

Mr. REID. I would say, Madam President, we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CORNYN. For a question? May I ask how much time we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORNYN. There was an objection to the request for extension on each side for morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that objection was heard.

Mr. CORNYN. There was objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

#### RICHARD CLARKE ALLEGATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I want to say a few words regarding some of the accusations we have seen in recent times coming out of the 9/11 hearing and the Richard Clarke allegations in his book. I think it is important, through all the clutter, for the American people to understand one point, if they understand anything, about all the debate and the politics and the political rhetoric and posturing that is going on surrounding this issue. That is a question that was asked during the course of the Commission hearing by Commissioner Gorton.

I think it is absolutely critical for the American people to understand both this question and this answer by Mr. Clarke. The question is from Commissioner Gorton of the 9/11 Commission, inquiring into the causes and circumstances giving rise to 9/11:

... Assuming that the recommendations that you made on January 25th of 2001 ... which had been an agenda item at this point for 2½ years without any action ... assuming that that had all been adopted say on January 26th, [when President Bush came to office] year 2001, is there the remotest chance that it would have prevented 9/11?

Mr. Clarke answered, "No."

I believe the American people need to understand that Mr. Clarke is not assigning blame to President Bush or his administration for what happened on 9/11, nor could he. As a matter of fact, we had seen, during the preceding years of the Clinton administration when Mr. Clarke held the role of counterterrorism chief, a number of attacks against the United States of America and against our soil.

In 1993, Osama bin Laden directed al-Qaida's first successful terrorist attack on U.S. soil, blowing up a car bomb in the basement garage of the World Trade Center in New York City killing 6 and wounding 1,000. In 1996, there was another attack on the U.S. Air Force's Khobar Towers barracks in Saudi Arabia killing 19 Americans and wounding 515 Americans and Saudis. In 1998, U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania were attacked by al-Qaida suicide bombers who killed 234 people and wounded more than 5,000. In 2000, al-Qaida attacked the USS *Cole* killing 17 American sailors and wounding 39.

So it is clear that during the preceding 8 years that Osama bin Laden had been terrorizing America and taking American lives in the process.

It is simply unfair for Mr. Clarke, or anyone else for that matter, to suggest that during the 8 months President Bush was in office that he should have or could have somehow done anything more than was done to try to prevent the events of 9/11. And, indeed, Mr. Clarke in a flash of candor through all of the attempts he has made to try to promote his new book—and, by the way, he has been very successful; I see on Amazon.Com his book is the No. 1 or No. 2 most ordered book. He has been very successful in promoting his book—but in a flash of amazing candor,

we see that he now admits there is nothing the Bush administration could have done in 8 months that the Clinton administration had not done in 8 years to prevent the tragic events of 9/11.

Some in Washington, DC, I guess we have all come to learn, are world-class second guessers. Now armed with the benefit of hindsight, there are those who want to pick through the rubble, through e-mails, and through memos to try to assign blame.

But we ought to be clear about this: The blame for what happened on 9/11 lies squarely with Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida—not on the American people, not on President Clinton and his administration, and not on the President or his administration. These are good, patriotic Americans who I am confident were doing everything they knew of that they could possibly do to prevent the terrible tragedy this Nation suffered on 9/11.

It is insulting that anyone would suggest this administration or the previous administration, now with the benefit of 20-20 hindsight, might have done something to stop this unfathomable horror.

It is important to place responsibility where it lies; and that is with al-Qaida and Osama bin Laden.

We also find ourselves in a strange new dimension where on the one hand President Bush is criticized for acting too decisively to take out al-Qaida, to take down the Taliban government in Afghanistan and then remove a blood-thirsty tyrant in Saddam Hussein, and now, on the other hand, these same critics want to complain that he should have done more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I was told that the Senator from Texas didn't understand what I said. What I said earlier was that Senator DASCHLE wanted to speak and that is why I objected. I ask unanimous consent that the time on both sides be extended for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Nevada.

We ought to be very clear about where the blame lies for the events of September 11.

But I point out one thing: President Bush has acted as decisively as any leader could have possibly acted in removing the Taliban from Afghanistan, by disrupting the training camps of al-Qaida in that country and then acting decisively against Saddam Hussein. The United Nations issued 14 different resolutions threatening him with the use of force if he did not comply with those resolutions, which he had never complied with during the entire course of the post-gulf-war period from 1991.

I think most Americans would be a little surprised to learn we never had a peace treaty after 1991, because Saddam Hussein continued to defy the

United Nations and the free world by his continued acts of avoiding United Nations inspections. He played a game of cat and mouse. Just when he thought we were developing the courage—the United Nations and others—to take him to task, he would relent temporarily only to kick the inspectors out and continue to defy the United Nations inspections.

My final point is there are some, including the Senator from Massachusetts, who have called the war in Iraq “another Vietnam.” The Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, I think did as good a job as possibly could have been done—certainly a person who has enormous credibility on that issue, having served so ably in Vietnam and, unfortunately, having been a prisoner of war there for a time—I think he did a very good job of refuting that and really showing the truth about that sort of scurrilous accusation. It is the kind of speech I worry has the possibility of a tremendously negative effect on our war on terror.

Our enemies should not be confused about our commitment to follow through, win the war on terror and crush our enemies in the process.

I grew up during the course of the Vietnam war. I remember what it was like in this country when our men and women in the field returned to this country only to find the American people did not support them as they should have and where America lost its resolve and strength of will. We should never let that happen again. It was a terrible American tragedy. For anyone to suggest that America is going to suffer loss of will or resolve in winning this war on terror is simply wrong.

I think we should not be fooled into thinking when Senators or any government official or anyone stands up and equates what is happening in Iraq and what is happening in Afghanistan and what is happening generally in the war on terror with Vietnam—they are providing fodder for our enemies. They are encouraging our enemies to think that perhaps we will lose our resolve and give rise to, I think, increased attacks against our troops on the ground and undermining our war effort generally.

I certainly don't suppose anyone is doing that intentionally. But I think we need to be careful about the words we use.

I know a short time remains in our morning business. I see the distinguished majority whip on the floor.

I would say in closing that words are important. Words have meaning. The words that are said today won't be remembered just in the context of election year and partisan politics; they will stand in history for future generations to read and study with a critical eye. In the end, we must focus on the battle with our common foe and not on each other.

I yield the floor.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, on our side we have 40 minutes, with the first 15 minutes yielded to the Senator from Connecticut and the second 15 minutes to the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS. My counterpart is in the Chamber and wishes to speak. The Republicans have the first division of time this morning. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. MCCONNELL. How much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes eleven seconds on the Republican side.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I am not certain I can finish in 5 minutes. I wonder if it would be all right with the other side to have 10 minutes instead of 5.

Mr. REID. No objection. That would be yielded on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

#### TERRORISM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, there is no question the terrorists are at war with us. Unfortunately, it is becoming increasingly apparent in Washington we are at war with each other.

The September 11 Commission is holding hearings right now. It has an admirable goal of investigating the reasons that our immigration, intelligence, law enforcement, military, and legal systems failed to prevent 19 Islamic radicals from hijacking planes and using them as weapons of terror so we can prevent such lapses in the future.

Already the Bush administration and Congress have acted to reform numerous agencies and procedures to deter and to prevent future terrorist attacks on our country. What have we done? We have responded to terrorism vigorously by attacking the terrorists where they live and confronting the regimes that support them, rather than by lobbing a few cruise missiles at an empty desert tent.

We created the Department of Homeland Security to put all domestic security agencies under one roof. We overwhelmingly passed the USA PATRIOT Act which provides law enforcement agencies the tools they need to monitor, apprehend, and convict terrorists. We have cracked down on terrorists' financing at home and abroad by shuttering sham charities that fund terror and by freezing terrorists' assets. We have streamlined and reformed the intelligence agencies and are working to improve coordination among the many agencies responsible for protecting America.

Hopefully, the Commission will identify additional methods to improve U.S. security, but forgive me for not being terribly optimistic. I fear the Commission has lost sight of its goal and has become a political casualty of the electoral hunting season.

Sadly, the Commission's public hearings have allowed those with political

axes to grind, such as Richard Clarke, to play shamelessly to the partisan gallery of liberal special interests seeking to bring down the President. These special interest groups have undeniably exploited the Commission for political gain. Moveon.org, for example, the ultra liberal organization that opposed America's liberation of both Iraq and Afghanistan—Moveon.org opposed the liberation of Afghanistan as well as Iraq—is funding TV ads that use Clarke's voice to accuse President Bush of not doing enough to stop terrorism. Moveon.org will launch a \$200,000 ad campaign that restates this claim during CNN's coverage of Dr. Rice's testimony before the Commission this morning.

Clarke himself, publicly and under oath, has said he believes that even had the President implemented every single one of the suggestions he made to the President when he came into office, we would still not have been able to prevent the September 11 attacks. Let's take a look at that again. Mr. Clarke himself has said that even if President Bush had done everything he recommended to the President, we could not have prevented the September 11 attacks.

Before deciding to profit from his revisionist history, Clarke argues persuasively that President Bush's policy to combat terrorism was more aggressive than that of his predecessor. Clarke noted that President Bush expressed frustration with the previous policy of “swatting at flies” and that the President authorized a fivefold increase for covert operations against terrorists in Afghanistan.

The Washington blame game has distracted us from the important task at hand: Winning the war against the terrorists. The only entity responsible for September 11 was al-Qaida. We need a real debate in America about how to prosecute the war against terrorism because there are two fundamentally different schools of thought about how to win this war, two fundamentally different philosophies about how to win this war.

On the one hand, there are the President's critics who define terrorism so narrowly as to include only the terrorists directly responsible for September 11, and not the many other terrorist groups currently plotting attacks against America and her allies. They believe this war can be fought under the auspices of the U.N., if only America would yield to the French or the Russians or the Chinese. They are unwilling to act alone when others refuse to confront by force those who choose death over life and violence over peace.

On the other hand, there are those who believe that al-Qaida is merely one head of the hydra and that to kill the beast of terrorism you must drain the swamp in which the beast lives and the terrorists thrive. We have done that in Afghanistan, we are doing that in Iraq, and we must do it everywhere terrorism thrives.